REMARKS

Claims 36 and 38-48 are currently pending, wherein claim 36 has been amended to include the subject matter of canceled claim 37, and claims 39 and 41 have been amended to depend from claim 36. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the remarks presented herein below.

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action ("Action"), the Examiner rejects claims 36-44 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite because "the transparent substrate" in claim 36 lacks antecedent basis. Claim 36 has been amended, thereby addressing the Examiner's concerns. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 36-44 under 35 U.S.C. §112.

In paragraph 3 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 36, 38 and 43-44 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Applicant's Related Art ("ARA"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In order to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102, the applied art must teach each and every claimed invention. In the present case, claims 36, 38 and 43-44 are not anticipated by ARA for at least the reason that ARA fails to disclose each and every claimed element, as discussed below.

Independent claim 36 defines an array substrate for use in a transflective liquid crystal display device. The array substrate comprises, *inter alia*, a reflective electrode formed on a transparent electrode, the reflective electrode having a double-layered structure. Independent claim 36 is not anticipated by ARA for at least the reason that ARA fails to disclose an array substrate that includes a reflective electrode formed on a transparent electrode, the reflective electrode having a double-layered structure.

Claims 38 and 43-44 variously depend from independent claim 36. Therefore, claims 38 and 43-44 are patentably distinguishable over ARA for at least those reasons presented above with respect to claim 36. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 36, 38 and 43-44 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

In paragraph 5 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 37 and 39-42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over ARA in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0109797 to Chung et al. ("Chung"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 37 and 39-42 variously depend from independent claim 36. Therefore, claims 37 and 39-42 are patentably distinguishable over ARA for at least those reasons presented above with respect to claim 36. Furthermore, Applicants note that the Chung reference is NOT prior art under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as discussed below.

The instant application is a divisional of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/984,805 filed 10/31/2001, now Patent No. 6,620,655, and claims priority to Korean Patent Application Nos. 2000-64739 and 2000-64740 filed 01/11/00. Certified copies of the Korean Applications were filed in the parent application (09/984,805). In addition, English translations of the priority documents are being filed herewith. Accordingly, Applicants have perfected a priority date of 01/11/00.

The Chung reference was filed in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on July 25, 2001, and published on August 15, 2002. In addition, the Korean application from which the Chung reference claims priority was filed on February 12, 2001. Accordingly, the Chung reference was not known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent, nor was it patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country more than a

year before the date of application for patent in the United States. Therefore, the Chung reference is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Accordingly, the rejection of claims 37 and 39-42 in view of the combination of ARA and Chung is improper. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 37 and 39-42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Finally, Applicants note that the Examiner has not addressed claims 45-48, which were added with the preliminary amendment filed on July 17, 2003. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner address claims 45-48 in the next Office Action.

The application is in condition for allowance. Notice of same is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner find the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: February 3, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Rebecca Goldman Rudich
Registration No.: 41,786
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006

Attorney for Applicants